REMARKS

Interview Summary Record

Applicants' representative gratefully appreciates the consideration given by Examiner Khare and Supervisory Patent Examiner Barts during the Interview on Tuesday, July 16, 2002. From a procedural point of view, agreement was reached during the interview that any subsequent office action will be a non-final Office Action. This is because Applicants' representative addressed all outstanding issues in the Preliminary Remarks filed on June 15, 2001. However, the arguments of Applicants' representative were not considered or addressed in the outstanding Office Action. The Arguments of Applicants' representative presented during the Interview have been incorporated into the remarks hereinbelow.

American Inventors Protection Act

The Examiner indicates that the changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the AIPA do not apply to the examination of this application. The present application was filed as a Rule 53(b) application on June 15, 2001. This application was not filed as an RCE. Thus, AIPA does appear to apply. Clarification is requested.

Rejection of Claims 1-26 Under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Either Mausner or Taylor-McCord

Claims 1-26 have been rejected by the Examiner as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by either U.S. Patent 5,215,759 to Mausner or U.S. Patent 5,266,318 to Taylor-McCord for the reasons set forth on page 2 of the Office Action. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Reconsideration and withdrawal thereof are requested.

Any rejection of claims 1-26 as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by either U.S. Patent 5,215,759 filed on October 1, 1991, to Mausner or U.S. Patent 5,266,318 filed on December 9, 1991, to Taylor-McCord should be removed in view of the Rule 131 Declarations filed in the parent application.

The Examiner's attention is again directed to the Rule 131 Declaration executed on December 29, 1997 by inventor Dr. Karen K. Brown. A copy of this Declaration is attached for the Examiner's convenience. Paragraph 8 on page 3 of the Declaration clearly states that the tests were conducted prior to December 9, 1991, which is the date that the Taylor-McCord et al. publication was filed, and prior to October 1, 1991, which is the date that Mausner was filed. Accordingly, it is readily apparent that neither reference cited by the Examiner is prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

As pointed out during the interview, these Declarations were readily available to the Examiner but they have not been

considered with respect to this rejection. As such, any subsequent Office Action, should be non-final.

Accordingly, in view of the Declarations of record, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-26 as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) are requested.

Rejection of Claims 1-26 Under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Lowry

Claims 1-26 have been rejected by the Examiner as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by U.S. Patent 4,900,550 to Lowry for the reasons set forth on page 3 of the Office Action. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Reconsideration and withdrawal thereof are requested.

The rejection of claims 1-26 as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by U.S. Patent 4,900,550 to Lowry is overcome in view of the amendments of record.

Applicant's representative maintains that with respect to the Lowry reference, there is no anticipation or *prima facie* case of obviousness since the ingredients in the Lowry reference are not present in a pharmaceutically effective amount. Applicants' position is supported by the testing of record which show that even higher amounts of the ingredients described in the composition of the Lowry reference do not produce the claimed pharmaceutical effect. As a result, it is readily apparent that the lower amounts of the ingredients of the Lowry reference would

also not contain pharmaceutically effective amounts of the active ingredient and effective amounts of the essential oil in order to obtain the claimed method of use of the pharmaceutical composition.

The Lowry reference does not anticipate or suggest the present invention because the active ingredient is not present in a pharmaceutically effective amount. The Lowry reference does not anticipate or suggest the present invention since it discloses an amount of essential oil which is not sufficient to allow penetration of the dermis of mammals by the complex carbohydrate.

The description in column 4, line 13 of the Lowry reference discloses that hyaluronic acid is present in an amount of 0.09-0.11 wt.%. The description in column 6, line 17 of Lowry et al. discloses that hyaluronic acid is present in an amount of 0.05-0.10 wt.%. The amount of hyaluronic acid disclosed in the Lowry reference is not a pharmaceutically effective amount when combined in the low amounts of essential oil disclosed in Lowry. In order to support Applicant's position, the attached Declaration under 37 C.F.R. 1.132 again is provided. This Declaration shows that when hyaluronic acid is used at a concentration below 0.3 wt.% when combined with 2% vol/vol tea tree oil, the composition will not have pain relieving effect. Thus, the lower amounts of hyaluronic acid and essential oil of

the Lowry reference would be pharmaceutically ineffective and thus not fall within the scope of the present invention.

In column 3, line 8 of the Lowry reference, jojoba oil is said to be present in an amount of 0.18-0.22 wt.%. In column 3, line 67 of the Lowry reference, sweet almond oil is said to be present in an amount of 0.09-0.11 wt.%. In column 6, line 8, jojoba oil is said to be present in an amount of 0.1-0.03 wt.%. Therefore, the composition of the Lowry reference cannot be said to anticipate the claimed invention, because it does not disclose or suggest effective amounts of the claimed ingredients for the claimed function(s).

In summary, the Lowry composition contains hyaluronic acid below 0.3 wt.% and essential oil below 2% vol/vol. Therefore, the Lowry compositions are not inherently pharmaceutically effective. Thus, the Lowry reference does not anticipate or suggest the present invention.

In view of the remarks hereinabove, all outstanding rejections including the rejection of the claims over the Lowry reference, have been overcome. Allowance of all claims is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any questions concerning this application, he is requested to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicant(s)

respectfully petition(s) for a two month extension of time for filing a reply in connection with the present application, and the required fee of $200.00 is attached hereto.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 

Marc S. Weiner
Reg. No. 32,181

Post Office Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

MSW/sh
2059-0106P

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

IN THE SPECIFICATION

The paragraph beginning on page 1, line 4 and ending on line 10, has been amended as follows:

This application is a continuation of copending Application No. 09/277,602, filed on March 29, 1999, which is a divisional of Application No. 08/241,692 filed May 12, 1994, the entire contents of which are hereby incorporated by reference and for which priority is claimed under 35 U.S.C. § 120.

PATENT
2059-101P

IN THE U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Harold BROWN

Serial No.: 08/241,692 Group: 1211

Filed: May 12, 1994 Examiner: H. Lee

For: A PHARMACEUTICAL COMPOSITION OF COMPLEX CARBOHYDRATES AND ESSENTIAL OILS AND METHODS OF USING THE SAME

DECLARATION UNDER 37 CFR 1.131

Honorable Commissioner of Patents
and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

I, Dr. Karen K. Brown, worked under the direction and control of the inventor, Dr. Harold Brown, and I declare as follows:

I am familiar with the prosecution history of U.S. Serial No. 08/241,692 filed May 12, 1994, including the Office Actions mailed August 8, 1997 and April 18, 1997. I am familiar with US Patent 5,266,318 to Taylor-McCord and US Patent 5,215,759 to Mausner cited by the Examiner in said Office Action(s). I will show that the present invention was reduced to practice prior to the publication date of the Taylor-McCord and Mausner patents.

1. Filing Dates of the Taylor-McCord and Mausner Patents

The filing date of the Taylor-McCord patent is December 9, 1991. The filing date of the Mausner patent is October 1, 1991.

2. The Claimed Invention

The composition of the claims of the invention comprises two components. The first component is an active ingredient of at least one low purity or cosmetic grade complex carbohydrate selected from the group consisting of polysaccharides, oligosaccharides, glycosaminoglycans, mannans, branched polysaccharides and sialylated oligosaccharides, having a molecular weight in the range of from 1,000 to less than 50,000 daltons, from 100,000 to 500,000 daltons, or greater than 750,000 daltons which is present in a pharmacologically effective amount. The second component is an essential oil present in an amount effective to allow penetration of the dermis of mammals by the complex carbohydrate.

3. Section A from the Notebook of Dr. Karen Brown

Section A recites the use of a composition of 1% hyaluronic acid, 1% chondroitin sulfate [i.e. both ingredients within the scope of invention as active ingredients], 2% peppermint oil [essential oil], on the acne of Patient 1.

4. Section B from the Notebook of Dr. Karen Brown

Section B recites the use of a composition of 1% Dermatan sulfate with 2% wintergreen oil on the rug burns of Patient 2.

5. Section C from the Notebook of Dr. Karen Brown

Section C recites the use of a composition of 1% high molecular weight cosmetic grade hyaluronic acid plus 1% chondroitin sulfate with 2% Rosemary oil for the heat-burn of Patient 3.

6. Section D from the Notebook of Dr. Karen Brown

Section D recites the use of a composition of 98% Aloe Vera extract with 1% Tea Tree Oil on the rug burns of Patient 4.

7. Section E from the Notebook of Dr. Karen Brown

Section E shows that the formulations discussed above worked effectively.

8. Tests occurred prior to Taylor-McCord (12/9/91) and Mausner (101/91)

These tests occurred prior to December 9, 1991, which is the date that the Taylor-McCord et al. publication was filed, and prior to October 1, 1991, which is the date that Mausner was filed.

I hereby declare that all statements made herein of my own knowledge are true and that all statements made on information and belief are believed to be true; and further that these statements and the like so made are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or

both, under Section 1001 of Title 18 of the United States Code and that such willful false statements may jeopardize the validity of the application or any patent issued thereon.

12/29/97
Date

Dr. Karen K. Brown

Enclosures: Pages 65-73 of Laboratory Notebook

(65)

Previously had an indication that Chondroitin sulfate + peppermint oil could heal sug burns (from indoor soccer). Need to confirm with some other situations + preparations.

Study Design:

1. Patient Interview
2. Provide Treatment or placebo
3. Interview weekly for 4 weeks.

Patient 1: Chronic Acne since puberty. Now Age 27. Face pitted with numerous acne lesions (red and pustules). Has tried "all OTC preps". None real help.

(A) Gave ~~it~~ a 30ml Chondroitin Sulfate (.07%) + 1% Hyaluronic acid + 2% peppermint oil. This is to be used 2xday.

Patient 2 Goalie for indoor soccer team. Chronic problem with sug burns. Age 42. Currently has sug burns on

from rug burns suffered 2 days previously. Past history indicates that this person would suffer from a rug burn for 7-10 days (oozing, cracking, bleeding) before finally healing. This person had to wear hose to her work & the hose stick to the rug burn interfering with any healing.

(B) Patient 2 was given a preparation containing 1% dermatan sulfate + 2% wintergreen oil.

Patient 3: Male, 53 yrs old. Burned right forearm while working on a muffler on motorcycle. Burn 8 x 12 cm. Just happened - burned area beginning to redden & raise. Certain that a blister will develop. Give this patient a preparation containing 1% high molecular (C) weight hyaluronic acid (Sleeve Oil.

Patient 4: Male, age 26, indoor soccer player. Has rug burn on elbow (Rt). Has continued to scab, crack, ooze, bleed for 2 days.

Gave preparation containing (D) 98% Aloe Vera extract combined with 1% Tea Tree Oil.

Each patient was told to apply the preparation as often as necessary but at least 2 times/day. Each was to keep track of results as well as make comment on preparations.

from rug burns suffered 2 days previously. Past history indicates that this person would suffer from a rug burn for 7-10 days (oozing, cracking, bleeding) before finally healing. This person had to wear hose to her work & the hose stick to the rug burn interfering with any healing.

Patient 2 was given a preparation containing 1% dermatan sulfate + 2% wintergreen oil.

Patient 3: Male, 33 yrs old. Burned right forearm while working on a muffler on motorcycle. Burn 8 x 12 cm just happened - burned area beginning to redden & raise. Certain that a blister will develop. Give this patient a preparation containing 1% high molecular weight hyaluronic acid (Lifecare mol wt > 500,000 + 1% Chondroitin sulfate (Organic) + 2% Rosemary Oil.

Patient 4: Male, age 26, indoor soccer player. Has rug burn on elbow (Rt). Has continued to scab, crack, ooze, bleed for 2 days.

Gave preparation containing 98% Aloe Vera extract combined with 1% Tea Tree Oil.

Each patient was told to apply the preparation as often as necessary but at least 2 times/day. Each was to keep track of results as well as make comment on preparations.

Laura Brown

(E) Results after 1 wk

Patient 1 - Patient reports that the pain associated with the pustules had disappeared within ~ 30 minutes after 1st use.
Within 3 days the acne was better. Oozing stopped, redness was reduced, pain gone completely.

Appearance at wk 1 - face - significantly reduced pustules, redness almost gone - swellings about 50% of original day seen. Patient reports that the preparation is painful on application onto open sores but then feels good (cool). The preparation is spreadable and feels like tightening skin on application.

Wants to continue use

Patient 2 - Reports severe pain on application to a fresh rug burn. She played soccer and suffered a burn on left knee below previous burn. She applied preparation within minutes after occurrence - while still bleeding. She states that the preparation burned so badly that she could hardly stand it. However she continued treatment because the response by her previous rug burns had been "incredible". B

Burns from [illegible] are completely healed. Skin is pink where burns had been - excellent healing. Patient states that the other burns had disappeared within 48 hrs.
The response to the new burn is surprising. The patient applied the preparation immediately, at 4 hr + 12 hr after the injury. Again it "burned like crazy" for about 1 min + then felt "cool".
It is now 72 hr after the new rug burn. The burn appears healed - Skin is

pink. No scabbing - no oozing.

Because of the complaint of pain on application, gave patient a new preparation. The second formulation contains 1% Chondroitin Sulfate and 2% Tea Tree Oil.

Patient is to use new preparation as any more suggestions & call me if she uses it with a report of results.

Patient does not need to return next wk since bases are healed.

Karen L Brown

Patient 2

Patient reports that blister never developed. Burned area appears normal today. Patient reports that within 5 minutes the severe pain was gone. Within 24 hrs all that was present was a reddened area. This disappeared by day 5.

Preparation was applied 2 times per day through day 5.

Patient will not need to return next week.

Karen L Brown

Patient 4: Patient reports that his preparation did not burn or cause pain on application. It felt "stingy" for a few minutes after then the pain of the burn was gone.
Patient applied the preparation 2 times per day. The burn was reported to have dried within 24 hrs of the 1st application. The dry scab fell off by 72 hrs after the 1st application. After the dried scab fell off the skin beneath was pink and not painful. The patient discontinued use by 4 days after the beginning of treatment.

Rug burn appears totally healed.

Patient does not need to return next wk.

Karen Brown

Patient 1: Patient very happy with results. Acne lesions essentially gone. Redness gone. Pitted areas still present but this would not be expected to improve. Patient reports no new lesions since beginning treatment. Friends are noticing improvement and have asked what medication patient is using. Patient explained that it was experimental.

Patient to return next week.

Patient
Face appears healed. No new lesions. Patient very happy. Patient applies preparation 3 times/day AM, afternoon, before bedtime.

Patient 1
Still no new lesions. Gave patient more (30ml) of same preparation. She is to continue to call + report results.

Karen Brown

IN THE U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Harold Brown

Serial No. 08/241,692 Group: 1211

Filed: May 12, 1994 Examiner: H. Lee

For: A PHARMACEUTICAL COMPOSITION OF COMPLEX CARBOHYDRATES AND ESSENTIAL OILS AND MEHODS OF USING THE SAME

DECLARATION UNDER 37 CFR 1.132

Honorable Commissioner of Patents
and Trademarks
Washington D.C. 20231

Sir:

I, Dr. Karen K. Brown, worked under the direction and control of the inventor, Dr. Harold Brown, and I declare as follows:

I am familiar with U. S. Patent 4,900,550 to Lowry cited by the Examiner as teaching the composition of the immediate invention. I will show that the composition of Lowry is not effective for use in the immediate invention as the concentration of the complex carbohydrate(s) taught by Lowry are too low to be used to relieve pain, inflammation, itching and swelling.

1. Compositions described by Lowry

Lowry teaches a Softener Component containing numerous ingredients, one of which is Aloe Concentrate (8.75-10.50 weight percent).

The Cell Penetrating Component also contains numerous ingredients, one of which is Hyaluronic Acid (0.09-0.11 weight percent), another of which is hydrolyzed mucopolysaccharides (0.09-0.11 weight percent). Additionally, this composition includes Aloe Concentrate (50.00-62.00 weight percent).

2. The Claimed Invention

The composition of the claims of the invention comprises two components. The first component is an active ingredient of at least one low purity or cosmetic grade complex carbohydrate selected from the group consisting of polysaccharides, oligosaccharides, glycosaminoglycans, mannans, branched polysaccharides and sialylated oligosaccharides, having a molecular weight in the range of from 1,000 to less than 50,000 daltons, from 100,000 to 500,000 daltons, or greater than 750,000 daltons which is present in a pharmacologically effective amount. The second component is an essential oil present in an amount effective to allow penetration of the dermis of mammals by the complex carbohydrate.

3. Section A from the Notebook of Dr. Karen Brown

Section A recites the use of a composition of 1% hyaluronic acid, 1% chondroitin sulfate [i.e. both ingredients within the scope of invention as active ingredients], 2% peppermint oil [essential oil], on the acne of Patient 1.

4. Section B from the Notebook of Dr. Karen Brown

Section B recites the use of a composition of 1% Dermatan sulfate with 2% wintergreen oil on the rug burns of Patient 2.

The Norishment and Protectant Component of the Lowry patent contains Hyaluronic Acid (0.05-0.10 weight percent) plus hydrolyzed mucopolysaccharides (0.9-0.11 weight percent). Additionally this component contains 50% Aloe Vera Solution (57-60 weight percent).

The Examiner has cited the compositions of Lowry as teaching the immediate invention.

2. The Claimed Invention

The composition of the claims of the invention comprises two components. The first component is an active ingredient of at least one low purity or cosmetic grade complex carbohydrate selected from the group consisting of polysaccharides, oligosaccharides, glycosaminoglycans, mannans, branched polysaccharides and sialylated oligosaccharides, having a molecular weight in the range of from 1,000 to less than 50.000 daltons, from 100,000 to 500,000 daltons, or greater than 750,000 daltons which is present in a pharmacologically effective amount. The second component is an essential oil present in an amount effective to allow penetration of the dermis of mammals by the complex carbohydrate.

3. Section F from the Notebook of Dr. Karen Brown

Section F recites several preparations which contain from 0.10 to 1.0 Wt. % Hyaluronic Acid combined with 2% vol/vol Tea Tree Oil.

4. Section G from the Notebook of Dr. Karen Brown

Section G shows that there was no pain-relieving effect from the preparations containing less than 0.3 Wt. % Hyaluronic Acid combined with 2% vol/vol Tea Tree Oil. At 0.3 Wt % the Hyaluronic Acid was effective in relieving the pain and swelling of a bruise.

5. Section H from the Notebook of Dr. Karen Brown

Section H indicates that Hyaluronic acid used at a concentration below 0.3 Wt. % combined with 2% vol/vol Tea Tree Oil was not effective in relieving the pain of a shin splint.

6. Section I from the Notebook of Dr. Karen Brown

Section I indicates that Hyaluronic acid used at a concentration below 0.3 Wt. % combined with 2% vol/vol Tea Tree Oil was not effective in relieving the pain caused by chronic chondromalacia of the knees.

7. Section J from the Notebook of Dr. Karen Brown

Section J indicates that Hyaluronic acid used at a concentration below 0.3 Wt. % combined with 2% vol/vol Tea Tree Oil was not effective in relieving the pain and swelling associated with rhematoid arthritis.

8. Section K from the Notebook of Dr. Karen Brown

Section K indicates that Hyaluronic acid used at a concentration below 0.3 Wt. % combined with 2% vol/vol Tea Tree Oil was not effective in relieving the itching associated with poison ivy.

9. Conclusion of the tests described in the Notebook of Dr. Karen Brown

When hyaluronic acid is used at a concentration below 0.3 wt.% when combined with 2% vol/vol tea tree oil, the composition will not have pain relieving effect. Thus, the lower amounts of hyaluronic acid and esential oil of the Lowry reference would be expected to be ineffective and thus not fall within the scope of the present invention. That is the Lowry compositions are not inherently pharmacologically effective.

I hereby declare that all statements made herein of my own knowledge are true and that all statements made on information and belief are believed to be true; and further that these statements and the like so made are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, under Section 1001 of Title 18 of the United State Code and that such willful false statements may jeopardize the validity of the application or any patent issued thereon.

1/31/98

Date

Dr. Karen K. Brown

day for 10 days — No bruising — did not lose hair.

Karen K Brown

Decided to try a similar experiment with HA. It seems to require less HA so will look at lower concentrations.

Purchased HA from Life-core Biomedical

(F) Prepared the following with Tea Tree Oil

HA Conc	Tea Tree Oil	
0.1	100ml aqueous 2%	A H
0.2		B H
0.3		C H
0.5		D H
0.8		E H
1.0		F H

We know that 1% works as well as 3% from previous experiments. Tested dog giving 10 ml of the prepared to the following people.

Karen K Brown

1. Robert Beck – Bruise & large swelling (2x4") caused by being kicked playing soccer (left shin)

(a)

Comments

A No effect
B No effect.
C OK – relieves pain for approx 3 hr
D Somewhat better than C – faster & longer pain relief
E Not tried – returned
F " " "

Karen K Brown

2. Peggy Cull – "Shin splint" from soccer. Cannot put weight on rt leg & run

(H)

A No effect
B No effect
C Excellent – relieves sharp pain – lasts ~ 1 hr
D Excellent – relieves all pain – lasts 2-3 hr
E Excellent] both same
F Excellent]

E & F were similar to D – effect in about 5 min & lasts ~ 4 hr

Karen K Brown

Vicki Olivas

Repeat with H.A preps
D Chondromalacia (chronic)
both knees

A No Effect
B No Effect
C Works but doesn't
last as long as
D → F
D E F all worked with
excellent results -
pain gone in 5 min -
lasts ~ 3 hr

Parent Brown

V Olivas indicates
that as long as she
uses D E or F she is
almost pain free -
3x per day K Brown

Joanne Saffron
Chronic rheumatoid arthritis
Cannot work - hands,
knees, feet extremely
painful
Real Challenge
Talked with her by phone
She will try anything
& report findings.

We agreed to have her try
on hands only. Not
hands

Joanne lives in Washington
DC so we cannot
visually see results.
However, she calls or
I call her weekly.

We agreed that 1st week
she try A, 2nd wk B
3rd wk C, 4th wk D
5th wk E 6th wk E.

Report / Joanne

Very disappointed - She reports the effect with A. She wants to stop.

I talk with her & we decide she should change to F for the next week.

(Reasoning - if this doesn't work then it won't work)

Karen Brown

Called Joanne -

She expresses surprise that F relieves her pain in her hands. She notices relief in about 15 min which lasts 3-4 hr. Nothing else works like this. She asks for more. She has used all of F. & we asked that she now try E - reassured her that it should work also.

Joanne called

She is elated & E works better. She says that if she uses it 3-4 times per day she can actually write. Again, she wants more of this one.

I asked her to now try D which she is hesitant to do - wants more E. & I have no more E so she has to use D.

Karen Brown

Summary

It appears that there is a clear minimal effective dose. This may be different for different complex carbohydrates. However, it appears that both 0.1% and 0.2% are not effective for either chondroitin sulfate or HA.

At a level of 0.3% an effect is observed.

At 0.5% the effect is clear.

This means that we could reduce the cost of active ingredient by at least 2X.

Current cost of cosmetic grade HA = $5000/kg

At 1% at 30ml vial uses $1.50 of HA. By dropping to 0.5% the cost drops to $.75/30ml. At 0.3% the cost of HA is $.45/30ml. This is much more cost effective.

Discussed with E. Cooper & Hal

Karen K Brown

I called Joanne. She again is quite happy. The results are still good! She uses the formulation 3-4 times per day and is virtually pain free. We will now try C. I have assured her that if this doesn't work I will give her more D.

(I)

Called Joanne

Still happy - C works - maybe not as well but she can still write. This seems to be her evaluation (beside pain) that something works. She will now try D.

Joanne called - Needs more C or D - B not working & she is getting contracted - pain restricting motion. I will send her more D.

Karen Brown

Called Joanne - She is again experiencing pain relief - wants to try E - I will send her another E.

Joanne has experienced significant relief and wants to buy this prep - I will get back with her.

I called C Cooper - she says to continue to supply Preps free to use Joanne to test products if she is interested. Hal agrees.

Called Joanne - told her of our decision but she wants C or D and will pay for materials at least.

I sent her 3-30 ml vials of a new prep containing 0.3% SDA (a/v) + 2% Wintergreen oil.

Received check for

(K)

KAREN BROWN

I was exposed to Poison ivy while cutting wood. I am very sensitive & still have poison ivy pustules around waist, and all the way down Rt leg. I decided to try the NA / Tea Tree Oil preps.

A - Used 2 days - No effect

B - Used 2 days - No effect

C - Seems to provide short-term relief - 2 days. Applied 6-10 x/da

D - Good relief from itching - seems to offer immediate relief - lasts ~ 2 hr

E Excellent - longer lasting

F Same as E

These preps relieve itching of P.I. & now my P.I. is gone -

Other preps had been used since 10/1/95 & P.I. had not disappeared.

I'm impressed!

Karen K Brown